

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED	INVENTOR		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	
08/805,50X	55/ M.	Sala Sala		est in	2.633 -0297 2	
_		0 880 / 09 11	コ	EXAMINER		
BUNCH STEWART KOLASCH & BURCH				Acom,	i.	
- F-O-BON 747 - Yalks-Church-V/A-22040-0747		D= 07/47		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				1511		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

•	Application No. 08/815,592	Applicant(s	Applicant(s) Maruta et al		
Office Action Summary	Examiner Tae H. Yoon		Group Art Unit		
☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
☐ This action is FINAL .				·	
☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance exc in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quay!			on as to the mei	its is closed	
A shortened statutory period for response to this action is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. I application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). I 37 CFR 1.136(a).	Failure to respond with	in the perio	d for response v	vill cause the	
Disposition of Claims					
X Claim(s) 1-21		is/are	pending in the a	pplication.	
Of the above, claim(s) 9-21		is/are w	vithdrawn from o	consideration.	
☐ Claim(s)		i	s/are allowed.		
		i	s/are rejected.		
Claim(s)		i	s/are objected to	o.	
☐ Claims	are subject	ct to restrict	tion or election r	equirement.	
Application Papers See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent I The drawing(s) filed on is/are The proposed drawing correction, filed on	objected to by the Ex	aminer.	_disapproved.	,	
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	. <u>-</u>				
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exam	iner.			+	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign processing and the CERTIFIED control of th	ppies of the priority do ial Number) om the International Bu	cuments ha	ve been _ · Rule 17.2(a)).		
Attachment(s) Notice of References Cited, PTO-892 Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Pall Interview Summary, PTO-413 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, Functional Patent Application, PTO-152	aper No(s)2_		,,		

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 1511

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

Claims 1-8, drawn to a combination of powders, classified in class 523, subclass
 205+.

II. Claims 9-21, drawn to a method of coating, classified in class 427, subclass 407.1+.

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be used in a rotational molding composition as evidenced by EP 87 204.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for invention II is not required for invention I restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

During a telephone conversation with Mr. Faraci on September 2, 1997 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-8. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in responding to this Office action. Claims 9-21 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Art Unit: 1511

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The recited language is not clear in claim 1, and thus the insertion of "made" or "obtained" after "homogeneous hue" is suggested, for example. In claim 8, the recite "---composition comprising two or more powder coatings selected from the combination of --- " is confusing since it is not clear whether said composition means "the combination (mixture) of powder coatings" or "the combination (mixture) of powder coating mixtures of claims 1-7".

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1511

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Morgan et al (US 5,319,001).

Morgan teaches colored powder coating compositions comprising a mixture of particles of at least two different colors at col. 1, line 60 to col. 2, line 2. Morgan is silent as to the recited properties of powder coatings, but the Examiner believes that said properties are inherently present in the powder coating compositions of Morgan since Morgan teaches that the basic color powder coating compositions used to form the mixtures should have similar melting point, melt viscosity, surface tension and other rheological properties to one another so that they flow and level to same extent when the powder coating is applied to a substrate at col. 3, lines 40-48. The instantly recited properties are related to rheological properties.

Thus, applicants' invention lacks novelty, and the use of the recited range of properties is an obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention since Morgan teaches the use of mixtures having similar properties.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Fitzgerald (US '571) alone, or in view of Morgan et al.

Fitzgerald teaches a powder coating composition containing at least two different colored powders in abstract and examples. The instantly recited properties are inherently present in powder coating compositions of Fitzgerald. Morgan teaches the mixtures of powder coatings having similar properties.

Art Unit: 1511

Thus, applicants' invention lacks novelty, and it would have been obvious to one ordianry skill in the art at the time of invention to utilizes powder coatings having similar properties in Fitzgerald in order to obtain homogeneous colors with or without teaching of Fitzgerald since it is well known as evidenced by Morgan absent showing otherwise.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over EP 87 204.

EP teaches a mixture of polymeric powders having different pigments in abstract and examples. The Examiner's position is that the powders of EP inherently possess the recited properties. The instant invention further recites the use of white-colored powder and non-white-colored powder over EP.

Thus, applicants' invention lacks novelty, and it would have been obvious to one of ordianry skill in the art at the time of invention to utilize a white pigment and non white pigment in EP since EP teaches the use of pigments having different colors and since the use of pigments having different colors depending on the desired final color is conidered a routine absent showing otherwise.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tae H. Yoon whose telephone number is (703) 308-2389. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thr from 8:00 to 5:30.

Art Unit: 1511

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan, can be reached on (703) 306-2777. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-5433.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [vasu.jagannathan@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-2351.

THY/September 2, 1997

TAE YOON
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1500

Joel Com